

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4. As a result, claims 1-4 and 7-8 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Butterworth et al. (US 2004/0133656 A1), hereinafter “Butterworth”, in view of Lewontin (US 2005/0071419 A1), Roberts et al. (US 2003/0135584 A1), hereinafter “Roberts”, and Koeppel (US 2005/0015491 A1). Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Roberts, and Koeppel teaches or suggests “checking, using a checker on the client server, for the redirection in the header of the message, wherein the redirection includes a redirection command that is included in a specification of the message exchange protocol” as claimed therein. See claim 1 (and similarly claim 4).

The Office admits that Butterworth, Lewontin, and Roberts fail to teach or suggest this feature. See Office Action, page 5. Applicants agree. However, in support of the rejection, the Office points to paragraph [0094] and step 1333, FIG. 13 of Koeppel to allegedly remedy this deficiency. See *Id.* In particular, the Office contends that Koeppel teaches “determining whether any redirect tags are present in the data stream received from a web service” and asserts that checking the entire data stream would allegedly include checking the header. See *Id.* However, Applicants contend that the redirect tags in Koeppel fail to teach or suggest a redirection that includes a redirection command that is included in a specification of a message exchange protocol, as provided in the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants contend that Koeppel fails to teach or suggest this feature of claim 1, and similarly claim 4, and respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 2-3 and 7, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims, which depend from claim 1, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Roberts, and Koeppel.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office’s combinations and modifications of the various references or the

motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Elaine Chi Berlin/

Elaine Chi Berlin
Reg. No. 61,194

Dated: December 19, 2011

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile